

ASYMPTOTIC EXPANSIONS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS OF COMPOUND SUMS OF LIGHT SUBEXPONENTIAL RANDOM VARIABLES

Ph. Barbe⁽¹⁾, W.P. McCormick⁽²⁾ and C. Zhang⁽²⁾

⁽¹⁾CNRS, France, and ⁽²⁾University of Georgia

Abstract. We derive an asymptotic expansion for the distribution of a compound sum of independent random variables, all having the same light-tailed subexponential distribution. The examples of a Poisson and geometric number of summands serve as an illustration of the main result. Complete calculations are done for a Weibull distribution, with which we derive, as examples and without any difficulties, 7 terms expansions.

AMS 2000 Subject Classifications: Primary: 60F99. Secondary: 60K05, 60G50, 41A60.

Keywords: asymptotic expansion, convolution, tail area approximation, regular variation, subexponential distributions.

1. Introduction. In this paper, we construct asymptotic expansions for the tail area $\overline{G}$ of a compound sum, when the summands belong to a class of light-tailed subexponential distributions. To be more precise, let X_i , $i \geq 1$, be a sequence of independent random variables, all having the same distribution F . For any positive integer n the partial sums $S_n = X_1 + \cdots + X_n$ have distribution the n -fold convolution $F^{\star n}$. We set $S_0 = 0$ and therefore $F^{\star 0}$ is defined as the distribution of the point mass at the origin. Let N be a non-negative integer-valued random variable, independent of the X_i 's. We consider the distribution G of the compound sum S_N , that is $EF^{\star N}$. Its tail area is $\overline{G} = 1 - G$. First order asymptotic results for $\overline{G}$ have been obtained by Embrechts, Goldie and Veraverbeke (1979), Cline (1987), Embrechts (1985) and Grübel (1987). A second order formula may be found in Omey and Willekens (1987).

Compound sums or subordinated distributions arise as distribution of interest in several stochastic models. In insurance risk theory, it models the total claim amount. For a discussion of issues related to random sums and insurance risk, we refer to Embrechts, Klüppelberg and Mikosch (1997), Asmussen (1997), Goldie and Klüppelberg (1998). Compound sums also appear in queueing theory, in connection with the stationary distribution of waiting times in the GI/G/1 queue. The connection here is not as direct

as in the insurance risk model in that it is derived from an analysis of ladder heights for transient random walks; see, for example, Asmussen (1987, p.80), Feller (1971, p.396) and Pakes (1975). Another common way in which this model occurs is through the solution of a transient renewal equation. An example of this occurs in branching processes, where we obtain a geometric-compound sum in the analysis of the mean number of particles alive at a given time in an age-dependent subcritical process; see Athreya and Ney (1972, p.151). We refer to Feller (1971, chapter XI) for a discussion of transient renewal theory. For further applications of subexponentiality in transient renewal theory, we refer to Teugels (1975) and Embrechts and Goldie (1982).

Throughout the paper, we assume that the X_i 's are nonnegative.

2. Main results. If it exists, the hazard rate $h = F'/\bar{F}$ yields the representation of the distribution function F as

$$\bar{F}(t) = \bar{F}(t_0) \exp\left(-\int_{t_0}^t h(u) du\right).$$

We write Id the identity function on $\mathbb{R}$; for any positive real number r , the function Id^r maps t to t^r . From the representation of $\bar{F}$ with its hazard rate, we see that if $h \sim \alpha/\text{Id}$ at infinity, then $\bar{F}$ is regularly varying with index $-\alpha$. If $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) = \alpha$ then $\bar{F}(t) = e^{-\alpha t(1+o(1))}$ has a tail behavior close to that of an exponential distribution. Since we are interested in light subexponential tails, it is natural to consider hazard rates such that

$$\begin{aligned} h \text{ is regularly varying,} \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} th(t) = +\infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} h(t) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

In order to be not too close to the Pareto type distributions, we will strengthen this assumption by requiring that

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} th(t)/\log t > 0. \tag{2.2}$$

This excludes distributions with tail $e^{-(\log t)^a}$ with $a < 2$, but include those for which $a \geq 2$. It also includes the subexponential Weibull distributions, or more generally, those with tail of the form $t^\beta e^{-t^\alpha}$ with α positive and less than 1.

As observed in Barbe and McCormick (2004, 2005), smoothness is a key requirement to obtain asymptotic expansions. For our purposes, a good class of regularly varying functions are the smoothly varying ones of given order, whose definition we now recall.

Definition. *A function h is smoothly varying of index α and order m if it is ultimately m -times continuously differentiable and its m -th derivative is regularly varying of index $\alpha - m$.*

Clearly, if the hazard rate is m times differentiable, the tail function $\bar{F}$ can be differentiated $m + 1$ times.

The next notation we need to introduce pertains to the Laplace characters. We write D the derivation operator; that is, if g is differentiable, Dg is its derivative. As is customary, we define D^0 to be the identity, and for any positive integer i we define D^i by induction as DD^{i-1} .

We write $\mu_{F,i}$ the i -th moment of F .

Definition. *(Barbe and McCormick, 2004). Let F be a distribution function having at least m moments. Its Laplace character of order m is the differential operator*

$$L_{F,m} = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} \frac{(-1)^i}{i!} \mu_{F,i} D^i.$$

Laplace characters have useful algebraic properties which are described in Barbe and McCormick (2004). In particular, consider the ring $\mathbb{R}_m[D]$ defined as the quotient ring of polynomials in D modulo the ideal generated by D^{m+1} . Laplace characters are elements of this ring, and can be multiplied. It may be helpful to think of a Laplace character as a formal Laplace transform Ee^{-XD} where X has distribution F , expressed as a formal Taylor series in D , dropping all terms in $D^{m+1}, D^{m+2}, \dots$. Then, the multiplication in the ring $\mathbb{R}_m[D]$ amounts to the usual multiplication of Taylor series, dropping any term in $D^{m+1}, D^{m+2}, \dots$. In particular, in $\mathbb{R}_m[D]$, we have $L_{H*K,m} = L_{H,m} L_{K,m}$. In what follows, we always consider Laplace characters of order m as members of $\mathbb{R}_m[D]$, and all the operations on Laplace characters are in that quotient ring.

The following theorem provides an asymptotic expansion for the tail of G .

Theorem 2.1. *Let F be a distribution function whose hazard rate is smoothly varying with negative index at least -1 and positive order m . Assume further that (2.2) holds and that the moment generating function of N is finite in a neighborhood of the origin. Then for any nonnegative integer k at most m*

$$\overline{G} = ENL_{F^{*(N-1)},k}\overline{F} + o(h^k\overline{F}).$$

Remark. It is shown in Barbe and McCormick (2005, Lemma 4.1.1) that under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 the asymptotic equivalence $\overline{F}^{(k)} \sim (-1)^k h^k \overline{F}$ holds. Therefore, the remainder term in the above formula could be written as $o(\overline{F}^{(k)})$.

3. Examples. We illustrate the use of Theorem 2.1, considering the cases where N has a Poisson and a geometric distribution.

Example 1. Assume that N has a Poisson distribution with parameter a . Sums with a Poisson number of summands are commonly used in insurance mathematics, modelling total claim size (see Beirlant et al., 1996, Embrechts et al., 1997, Willmot and Lin, 2000). The following expansion is easily derived.

Proposition 3.1. *Let F be a distribution function satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. If N has a Poisson distribution with parameter a , then $\overline{G} = aL_{G,m}\overline{F} + o(h^m\overline{F})$. Moreover, $L_{G,m} = e^{a(L_{F,m}-\text{Id})}$.*

Proof. Combine Theorem 2.1 and the proof of Corollary 4.4.2 in Barbe and McCormick (2004) to obtain the expansion $aL_{G,m}\overline{F}$. To obtain the expression for $L_{G,m}$, write, in the quotient ring,

$$ENL_{F,m}^{N-1} = e^{-a} \sum_{n \geq 1} n \frac{a^n}{n!} L_{F,m}^{n-1} = ae^{a(L_{F,m}-\text{Id})}. \quad \blacksquare$$

The above formula is easily implemented with a computer algebra system. For example, the following **Maple** code calculates $ae^{a(L_{F,m}-\text{Id})}$.

```

mu[0]:=1:
LF:=sum('(-1)^j*mu[j]*D^j/j!','j'=0..m+1):
taylor(a*exp(a*(LF-1)),D=0,m+1);

```

Setting $m = 3$ in the previous code yields the first four terms,

$$\begin{aligned}
E(NL_{F,4}^{N-1}) &= a\text{Id} - a^2\mu_{F,1}D + \frac{a^2}{2}(a\mu_{F,1}^2 + \mu_{F,2})D^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{a^2}{6}(a^2\mu_{F,1}^3 + 3a\mu_{F,1}\mu_{F,2} + \mu_{F,3})D^3.
\end{aligned}$$

To give a very concrete example, assume that $\overline{F}$ is the Weibull distribution with parameter $1/3$, so that $\overline{F}(t) = e^{-t^{1/3}}$. Define $e_r(t) = t^r e^{-t^{1/3}}$. We obtain, after evaluation of $E(NL_{F,4}^{N-1})$, and using a computer algebra package,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{G} &= ae_0 + 2a^2e_{-2/3} + 2a^2(20+a)e_{-4/3} + 4a^2(20+a)e_{-5/3} \\
&\quad + \frac{4a^2(1680+60a+a^2)}{3}e_{-2} + 8a^2(1680+60a+a^2)e_{-7/3} \\
&\quad + \frac{2a^2(403200+9120a+140a^2+a^3)}{3}e_{-8/3} + o(e_{-8/3}).
\end{aligned}$$

Perhaps the only remarkable feature of such 7 terms expansion is that it can be done.

Example 2. Motivated by applications to queueing theory (see e.g., Cohen, 1972, or Bingham, Goldie and Teugels, 1987, p.387), consider the case where N has a geometric distribution with parameter a , that is N is a nonnegative integer n with probability $(1-a)a^n$. Again, Theorem 2.1 provides a compact expression of the asymptotic expansion of $\overline{G}$, and the issue is how to actually compute it.

Any polynomial in D with nonvanishing constant term is invertible in the quotient ring $\mathbb{R}_m[D]$. Therefore,

$$ENL_{F^*(N-1),m} = (1-a) \sum_{n \geq 1} a^n n L_{F,m}^{n-1} = a(1-a)(\text{Id} - aL_{F,m})^{-2}.$$

Consequently, the following result holds.

Proposition 3.2. *Let F be a distribution function satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2.1. If N has a geometric distribution with parameter a , then $\overline{G} = a(1-a)(\text{Id} - aL_{F,m})^{-2}\overline{F} + o(h^m\overline{F})$.*

Setting $m = 3$, we obtain, as in the previous example, with the help of a computer algebra package, with $b = a/(1 - a)$,

$$\begin{aligned} ENL_{F,3}^{N-1} &= b \text{Id} - 2b^2 \mu_{F,1} D + b^2 (\mu_{F,2} + 3b \mu_{F,1}^2) D^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{b^2}{3} (12b^2 \mu_{F,1}^3 + 9b \mu_{F,1} \mu_{F,2} + \mu_{F,3}) D^3. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, when F is the Weibull distribution with parameter $1/3$, the calculation of $ENL_{F,4}^{N-1}$ yields the following 7 terms expansion — expressed solely with a , the formula contains alternating signs; it is numerically slightly more stable when expressed with $b = a/(1 - a)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{G} &= b e_0 + 4b^2 e_{-2/3} + 4b^2 (20 + 3b) e_{-4/3} + 8b^2 (20 + 3b) e_{-5/3} \\ &\quad + 32b^2 (140 + 15b + b^2) e_{-2} + 192b^2 (140 + 15b + b^2) e_{-7/3} \\ &\quad + 80b^2 (6720 + 456b + 28b^2 + b^3) e_{-8/3} + o(e_{-8/3}). \end{aligned}$$

4. Proof. When m vanishes, Theorem 2.1 is due to Embrechts, Goldie and Veraverbeke (1979, p.342). Therefore, we will prove it when m is at least 1.

It is convenient to introduce a pseudo-semi-norm on tails. If K is a distribution function, we write

$$|\overline{K}|_F = \sup_{t \geq 0} (\overline{K}/\overline{F})(t),$$

with the convention $0/0 = 0$. This generates balls $B(F, r)$ containing all tails $\overline{K}$ which are less than $r\overline{F}$. We write $B(F)$ the union of all these balls for all positive r .

We write G_n for the n -fold convolution $F^{\star n}$.

We start by recalling Kesten's global bound on tail function of self-convolutions of subexponential distributions; see Athreya and Ney (1972, §IV.4, Lemma 7). It asserts that for any positive ϵ there exists a positive A such that for all positive integers n ,

$$|\overline{G_n}|_F \leq A(1 + \epsilon)^n. \quad (4.1)$$

We also need a precise estimate of the order of magnitude of derivatives of $\overline{F}$. As noted in the Remark following Theorem 2.1,

Lemma 4.1.1 in Barbe and McCormick (2005) shows that for any nonnegative k at most m ,

$$\overline{F}^{(k)} \sim (-1)^k h^k \overline{F}. \quad (4.2)$$

Finally, we also need a basic representation of convolution in terms of operators. For any distribution function K with support in the nonnegative half-line and any η positive and less than 1, define the operator

$$T_{K,\eta} f(t) = \int_0^{\eta t} f(t-x) dK(x).$$

For any positive c we also define the multiplication operator M_c acting on functions by

$$M_c f(t) = f(t/c).$$

These two operators allow us to write a convolution in a way suitable for our analysis. Define the powers $T_{K,\eta}^n$ by $T_{K,\eta}^0 = \text{Id}$ and $T_{K,\eta}^{n+1} = T_{K,\eta} T_{K,\eta}^n$. Using Proposition 5.1.1 in Barbe and McCormick (2004) inductively we obtain a representation for the distribution function, valid on the nonnegative half line,

$$\overline{G}_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} T_{F,\eta}^{i-1} T_{G_{n-i}, 1-\eta} \overline{F} + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} T_{F,\eta}^{i-1} (M_{1/\eta} \overline{F} M_{1/(1-\eta)} \overline{G}_{n-i}). \quad (4.3)$$

Our first lemma is a simple moment bound.

Lemma 4.1. *Let i be a nonnegative integer, and let ϵ be a positive real number. There exists t_1 such that for any t at least t_1 and any distribution function K in $B(F)$,*

$$\int_t^\infty x^i dK(x) \leq (1 + \epsilon) |\overline{K}|_F t^i \overline{F}(t).$$

Proof. For any nonnegative integer i , an integration by parts yields

$$\int_t^\infty x^i dK(x) = t^i \overline{K}(t) + i \int_t^\infty x^{i-1} \overline{K}(x) dx. \quad (4.4)$$

The right hand side of this equality is less than $|\overline{K}|_F$ times the same expression with K replaced by F . Consequently, it suffices to prove

the result when K is F . In that case, let M be a positive real number so that $\epsilon(M-i) \geq i$. Since $\text{Id } h$ tends to infinity at infinity, h is more than M/Id ultimately. For any t large enough and any x at least t ,

$$\frac{\overline{F}(x)}{\overline{F}(t)} = \exp\left(-\int_t^x h(u) \, du\right) \leq \left(\frac{t}{x}\right)^M.$$

This implies that the integral in the right hand side of (4.4), when F is substituted for K , is at most $\epsilon t^i \overline{F}(t)$. $\blacksquare$

Our next lemma contains the main argument of the proof, namely that a $T_{K,\eta}$ operator is in some sense very close to a Laplace character as far as tail behavior is concerned when applied to $\overline{F}$ and its derivatives.

Lemma 4.2. *For any fixed integer p at most m ,*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{K \in B(F)} \frac{|(T_{K,\eta} - L_{K,m-p})\overline{F}^{(p)}|}{|\overline{K}|_F h^m \overline{F}}(t) = 0.$$

Proof. The proof of Lemma 4.2.3 in Barbe and McCormick (2005) shows that for any δ positive,

$$\left| \int_0^{\delta/h(t)} \overline{F}^{(p)}(t-x) \, dK(x) - L_{K,m-p} \overline{F}^{(p)} \right| \quad (4.5)$$

is at most

$$\sum_{0 \leq j \leq m-p} |\overline{F}^{(p+j)}(t)| \int_{\delta/h(t)}^{\infty} x^j \, dK(x) \quad (4.6)$$

$$+ \int_0^{\delta/h(t)} \int_0^x \frac{y^{m-p-1}}{(m-p-1)!} |\overline{F}^{(m)}(t-x+y) - \overline{F}^{(m)}(t)| \, dy \, dK(x). \quad (4.7)$$

Let ϵ be a positive number. Using Lemma 4.1 and (4.2), we see that for large t , the term (4.6) is less than

$$\overline{F}(t) 2|\overline{K}|_F \left(\frac{\delta}{h(t)}\right)^j \overline{F}\left(\frac{\delta}{h(t)}\right).$$

Since $\overline{F}$ is rapidly varying, this is ultimately less than $\epsilon |\overline{K}|_F h^m \overline{F}$.

The proof of Lemma 4.2.3 in Barbe and McCormick (2005) shows that for δ small enough, for any t large enough and for any K in $B(F)$, the double integral (4.7) is at most $\epsilon |\overline{K}|_F \mu_{F,m-p} h^m \overline{F}$. Hence, we have shown that (4.5) is at most $\epsilon |\overline{K}|_F (\mu_{F,m-p} + 1) h^m \overline{F}$ ultimately uniformly over $B(F)$.

The proof of Lemma 4.2.4 in Barbe and McCormick (2005) shows that for any positive δ and η , ultimately uniformly over $B(F)$,

$$\int_{\delta/h(t)}^{\eta t} |\overline{F}^{(p)}(t-x)| dK(x) \leq \epsilon |\overline{K}|_F h^m \overline{F}(t).$$

This proves Lemma 4.2. ■

Lemma 4.2 yields the following estimate on an operator T composed with a Laplace character applied to a derivative of $\overline{F}$.

Lemma 4.3. *The following uniform limit holds:*

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\substack{K \in B(F) \\ H: \mu_{H,m-p} < \infty}} \frac{|T_{K,\eta} L_{H,m-p} \overline{F}^{(p)} - L_{K \star H, m-p} \overline{F}^{(p)}|}{|\overline{K}|_F h^m \overline{F} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m-p} \frac{\mu_{H,j}}{j!}} = 0.$$

Proof. Since $T_{K,\eta}$ is linear and

$$L_{H,m-p} \overline{F}^{(p)} = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m-p} \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} \mu_{H,j} \overline{F}^{(p+j)},$$

the result follows from Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 2.1.4 in Barbe and McCormick (2004). ■

The next two lemmas will take care of some remainder terms. The first one asserts that terms of order $o(h^m \overline{F})$ remain so through the action of some T operators.

Lemma 4.4. *Let q be a nonnegative integer and ϵ be a positive real number. There exist t_2 , some positive A and η , such that for any positive integer i ,*

$$T_{F,\eta}^i(h^q \overline{F}) \leq A(1 + \epsilon)^i h^q \overline{F}$$

on $[t_2, \infty)$.

Proof. Let ϵ be a positive real number. Since h is regularly varying with negative index, provided η is small enough, $h(t-x) \leq (1+\epsilon)h(t)$ for any t large enough and any x nonnegative and at most ηt .

Therefore, for t at least t'_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{F,\eta}(h^q \overline{F})(t) &= \int_0^{\eta t} h^q \overline{F}(t-x) dF(x) \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon)h^q(t) \int_0^{\eta t} \overline{F}(t-x) dF(x) \\ &\leq (1+\epsilon)h^q(t) \overline{F}^{\star 2}(t). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, it follows that

$$T_{F,\eta}^i(h^q \overline{F})(t) \leq (1+\epsilon)^i (h^q \overline{F}^{\star(i+1)})(t).$$

Using Kesten's bound, (4.1) above, this yields that $T_{F,\eta}^i(h^q \overline{F})$ is ultimately at most $A(1+\epsilon)^{2i}h^q \overline{F}$, finishing the proof since ϵ is arbitrary. $\blacksquare$

Our penultimate lemma will be used to handle the terms involving the multiplication operators in (4.3).

Lemma 4.5. *Let ϵ be a positive real number. There exists t_3 such that for any positive integers i and m ,*

$$|M_{1/\eta} \overline{F} M_{1/(1-\eta)} \overline{G}_i| \leq (1+\epsilon)^i h^{m+1} \overline{F}$$

on $[t_3, \infty)$.

Proof. Kesten's bound shows that

$$|\overline{F}(t\eta) \overline{G}_i(t(1-\eta))| \leq \overline{F}(t\eta) A(1+\epsilon)^i \overline{F}(t(1-\eta)).$$

Arguing as in Lemma 4.2.1 in Barbe and McCormick (2005), $\overline{F}(t\eta) \overline{F}(t(1-\eta))$ is $o(h^q \overline{F}(t))$ for any positive q . This implies the result. $\blacksquare$

Our last lemma is stated merely to avoid digression in the argument later on.

Lemma 4.6. *Let ϵ be a positive number. There exists A such that for any positive integer n*

$$\sum_{0 \leq j \leq m} \frac{\mu_{G_n, j}}{j!} \leq A(1 + \epsilon)^n.$$

Proof. The lemma follows from Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund's inequality (see Chow and Teicher, 1988, §10.3, Theorem 3), which implies that $\mu_{G_n, j} \leq An^j$ for some constant A . ■

We can now conclude the proof of Theorem 2.1. Combining Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5, there exists an interval $[t_3, \infty)$ on which for any j and k with $0 \leq j \leq k \leq n$, any positive i and n with $i \leq n$,

$$|T_{F, \eta}^{i-1}(M_{1/\eta} \overline{F} M_{1/(1-\eta)} \overline{G}_{n-i})| \leq A(1 + \epsilon)^n h^{m+1} \overline{F}.$$

Representations (4.3) yield, on $[t_3, \infty)$,

$$|\overline{G}_n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} T_{F, \eta}^{i-1} T_{G_{n-i, 1-\eta}} \overline{F}| \leq An(1 + \epsilon)^n h^{m+1} \overline{F}. \quad (4.8)$$

Let ϵ be a positive real number, small enough so that $E(1 + 2\epsilon)^N$ is finite. Let δ be a positive real number. Combining Lemmas 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6, using also Kesten's bound, ultimately, uniformly in n and i at most n ,

$$\begin{aligned} & |T_{F, \eta}^{i-1} T_{G_{n-i, 1-\eta}} \overline{F} - T_{F, \eta}^{i-2} L_{G_{n-i+1, m}} \overline{F}| \\ & \leq T_{F, \eta}^{i-1} |(T_{G_{n-i, 1-\eta}} - L_{G_{n-i, m}}) \overline{F}| + T_{F, \eta}^{i-2} |(T_{F, \eta} L_{G_{n-i, m}} - L_{G_{n-i+1, m}}) \overline{F}| \\ & \leq 2\delta(A^2 + A)(1 + \epsilon)^n h^m \overline{F}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

Using the same combination of lemmas, we also have, ultimately, uniformly in n and j at most $n - 1$,

$$|T_{F, \eta}^j L_{G_{n-j-1, m}} \overline{F} - T_{F, \eta}^{j-1} L_{G_{n-j, m}} \overline{F}| \leq A^2(1 + \epsilon)^n \delta h^m \overline{F}. \quad (4.10)$$

We take A to be at least 1, simply to ensure that A^2 is more than A . Summing (4.10) for j positive and less than i and adding (4.9), we obtain

$$|T_{F, \eta}^{i-1} T_{G_{n-i, 1-\eta}} \overline{F} - L_{G_{n-1, m}} \overline{F}| \leq 4A^2 \delta h^m \overline{F} i(1 + \epsilon)^n$$

on some interval $[t_4, \infty)$. Summing these inequalities for i positive and at most n and combining with (4.8) yield

$$|\overline{G}_n - nL_{G_{n-1}, m}\overline{F}| \leq 10A^2\delta n(n+1)(1+\epsilon)^nh^m\overline{F}.$$

Since the moment generating function of N is finite at $\log(1+2\epsilon)$ and δ is arbitrary, Theorem 2.1 follows. ■

References

- S. Asmussen (1987). *Applied Probability*, Wiley.
- S. Asmussen (1997). *Ruin Probabilities*, World Scientific.
- K.B. Athreya, P.E. Ney (1972). *Branching Processes*. Springer.
- Ph. Barbe, W.P. McCormick (2004). Asymptotic expansions for infinite weighted convolutions of heavy tail distributions and applications, <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.PR/0412537>, submitted.
- Ph. Barbe, W.P. McCormick (2005). Asymptotic expansions for convolutions of light tailed subexponential distributions, <http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.PR/0512141>, submitted
- J. Beirlant, J.L. Teugels, P. Vynckier (1996). *Practical Analysis of Extreme Values*, Leuven University Press, Leuven, Belgium.
- N.H. Bingham, C.M. Goldie, J.L. Teugels (1989) *Regular Variation*, 2nd ed., Cambridge.
- D.B.H. Cline (1987). Convolutions of distributions with exponential and subexponential tails, *J. Austr. Math. Soc. (A)*, 43, 347–365.
- Y.S. Chow, H. Teicher (1988). *Probability Theory, Independence, Interchangeability, Martingales*, 2nd ed., Springer.
- J.W. Cohen (1972). On the tail of the stationary waiting-time distribution and limit theorem for M/G/1 queue, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré, B*, 8, 255–263.
- P. Embrechts (1985). Subexponential distribution functions and their applications: a review, in *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Probability Theory, (Braşov, 1982)*, 125–136, VNU Sci. Press, Utrecht, 1985.
- P. Embrechts, C.M. Goldie (1982). On convolution tails, *Stoch. Proc. Appl.*, 13, 263–278.
- P. Embrechts, C.M. Goldie, N. Veraverbeke (1979). Subexponentiality and infinite divisibility, *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb.*, 49, 335–347.
- P. Embrechts, C. Klüppelberg, T. Mikosch (1997). *Modelling Extremal Events*, Springer.

- W. Feller (1971). *An Introduction to Probability and its Applications*, 2nd ed., Wiley.
- C. Goldie, C. Klüppelberg (1998). Subexponential distributions, in *A Practical Guide to Heavy Tails, Statistical Techniques and Applications*, R. Adler, R. Feldman and M. Taqqu eds., Birkhäuser, 435–460.
- R. Grübel (1987). On subordinated distributions and generalized renewal measures, *Ann. Probab.*, 15, 394–415.
- E. Omeij, E. Willekens (1987). Second-order behaviour of distributions subordinate to a distribution with finite mean, *Comm. Statist. Stoch. Models*, 3, 311–342.
- A.G. Pakes (1975). On the tails of waiting-time distributions, *J. Appl. Probab.*, 12, 555–564.
- J.L. Teugels (1975). The class of subexponential distributions, *Ann. Probab.*, 3, 1000–1011.
- G.E. Willmot, X.S. Lin (2000). *Lundberg Approximations for Compound Distributions with Insurance Applications, Lecture Notes in Statistics*, 156, Springer.

Ph. Barbe
90 rue de Vaugirard
75006 PARIS
FRANCE

W.P. McCormick and C. Zhang
Dept. of Statistics
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
USA
{bill, czhang}@stat.uga.edu